UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FIFTY-FIRST SESSION

Official Records

FIFTH COMMITTEE
47th meeting
held on
Wednesday, 18 December 1996
at 11 a.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 47th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. SENGWE (Zimbabwe)

Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions: Mr. MSELLE

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 140: ADMINISTRATIVE AND BUDGETARY ASPECTS OF THE FINANCING OF THE UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 114: PROGRAMME PLANNING (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 122: UNITED NATIONS PENSION SYSTEM (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 112: REVIEW OF THE EFFICIENCY OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL FUNCTIONING OF THE UNITED NATIONS (continued)

COMPLETION OF THE COMMITTEE'S WORK FOR THE MAIN PART OF THE FIFTY-FIRST SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of the publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-794, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.5/51/SR.47
28 February 1997

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

96-82524 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 2.25 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 140: ADMINISTRATIVE AND BUDGETARY ASPECTS OF THE FINANCING OF THE UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS (continued) (A/C.5/51/L.34)

Draft resolution A/C.5/51/L.34

1. Mr. MADDENS (Belgium) introduced, on behalf of the Chairman, draft resolution A/C.5/51/L.34, which had been agreed upon in informal consultations. Section A of the draft resolution dealt with the composition of groups for the apportionment of peacekeeping appropriations and provided that Zambia should be included in the group of Member States set out in paragraph 3 (d) of General Assembly resolution 43/232.

2. Sections B and C dealt with the issue of Member States which were not included in any of the groups set out in resolution 43/232 and contained arrangements agreed upon in informal consultations. Section B provided that, from 1 January 1997, the Czech Republic should be included in the group of Member States set out in paragraph 3 (b) of resolution 43/232 and that, from 19 January 1993 through 31 December 1996, it would be included in the group of Member States set out in paragraph 3 (c) of the resolution. Section C provided that, from 19 January 1993 through 31 December 1996, Slovakia would be included in the group of Member States set out in paragraph 3 (c) of General Assembly resolution 43/232. Sections B and C also outlined the financial consequences of those decisions.

3. Section D provided that the General Assembly would continue its consideration of the item at its resumed fifty-first session. It was understood that the Committee would address, inter alia, the death and disability benefits of troops under an insurance scheme; mission subsistence allowance; the concept of a roving finance and management review officer; the Peacekeeping Reserve Fund; the rates of reimbursement to troop-contributing States; the management of peacekeeping assets and inventory control; the support account; reform of the procedures for determining reimbursement of contingent-owned equipment, in particular, the contribution agreement between the United Nations and participating States; third party liability claims and gratis personnel provided by Governments and other entities; and arrangements for apportionment of expenses of peacekeeping appropriations. He commended the draft resolution for adoption without a vote.

4. Mr. HO (Singapore) requested the Secretariat to issue a table, at the earliest possible date, showing the financial implications of placing the Czech Republic, Slovakia and Zambia in their respective groups for the apportionment of peacekeeping appropriations.

5. Ms. PEÑA (Mexico) said that her delegation would join the consensus but noted that new elements in the draft resolution changed the manner in which peacekeeping operations were financed. Under the special arrangements, the payment obligations of the permanent members of the Security Council were being transferred to the countries in group B.

6. Draft resolution A/C.5/51/L.34 was adopted.

7. Mr. BASNYAT (Nepal) said that, while his delegation had joined the consensus, it was regrettable that the Fifth Committee had been unable to discuss in depth many important aspects of agenda item 140 during the main part of the session, in particular, death and disability benefits for peacekeeping troops. He attributed the deferral to the fact that the Secretariat had provided incomplete information in response to questions raised by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions and by certain Member States, and to the inadequacy of the proposal submitted by the Secretariat. It seemed, however, that the Secretariat should be able to provide the necessary information and documents during the resumed session of the Assembly.

8. Mr. JESENSKY (Slovakia) welcomed the determination of his country's peacekeeping assessment for the period 1993-1996, which fully reflected its capacity to pay. Slovakia had actively participated in peacekeeping operations since becoming a Member State in 1993 and was prepared to assume its financial responsibilities in that regard. He expressed gratitude to the Committee for understanding his country's economic situation.

9. Mr. ARMITAGE (Australia), supported by Ms. DUSCHNER (Canada) and Ms. ALMAO (New Zealand), said that his delegation had joined the consensus because it represented an unusual opportunity to address anomalies and deficiencies of the ad hoc scale of assessments for peacekeeping operations. The current scale was not transparent, equitable, or in keeping with current realities. A piecemeal approach to revising it would not yield the desired results. While the draft resolution just adopted did not constitute the much-needed comprehensive revision of the scale, it introduced a number of necessary changes, which enjoyed his delegation's support.

10. Mr. GRANT (United States of America) said that, while sympathetic to the situation of Zambia, the Czech Republic and Slovakia, his delegation had joined the consensus with great reluctance. It was deeply concerned at the failure to address the basic problem, namely, the need for comprehensive consideration of the entire ad hoc scale of assessments for the financing of peacekeeping operations. If the General Assembly continued to make only piecemeal changes, the scale for the apportionment of peacekeeping appropriations would become even more distorted and Member States would lose confidence in it; that, in turn, would have dire consequences for the Organization's financial situation. His delegation trusted that the comprehensive review would take place in the coming months. It welcomed the plan described by the coordinator of the informal consultations for the consideration of other important issues under agenda item 140 which were still pending.

11. Mr. MUCHANGA (Zambia) thanked the Committee for facilitating the adoption of the resolution which placed Zambia in group D. In particular, he wished to express his appreciation to Mr. Maddens, the coordinator of the informal consultations.

12. Mr. SRAMEK (Czech Republic) also thanked Mr. Maddens and the Committee members for the adoption of the draft resolution.

13. Mr. TAKASU (Controller) announced that, on the following day, the Russian Federation would pay $57 million for peacekeeping operations, including $10 million for reimbursement of troop costs for the United Nations Operation in

Somalia (UNOSOM). That would bring the total contribution of the Russian Federation to $310 million in 1996.

14. Mr. GOKHALE (India) welcomed the Controller's announcement, in particular, the fact that a portion of the payment by the Russian Federation would be used to reimburse troop and equipment costs for the Somalia operation. His delegation looked forward to receiving the payment that was due it.

The meeting was suspended at 2.55 p.m. and resumed at 3.15 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 114: PROGRAMME PLANNING (continued) (A/C.5/51/L.37)

Draft resolution A/C.5/51/L.37

15. Mr. ALOM (Bangladesh) introduced draft resolution A/C.5/51/L.37, which was composed of the resolution proper and an annex. The annex contained the priorities to be addressed during the period covered by the medium-term plan and stated the programme activities of the medium-term plan.

16. The Committee for Programme and Coordination had been unable to reach consensus on the programme planning item, nor had it agreed on the structure or priority of the different programmes. The draft resolution currently before the Committee was a milestone because it proved that the Member States could ultimately reach agreement on even the most contentious of issues.

17. The draft resolution envisaged a total of 26 programmes. Disarmament had become an independent programme and decolonization a separate subprogramme. It had been agreed that human rights would be viewed in the broader aspect of planning. In addition, a separate programme would be devoted to the activities of the Office of Internal Oversight Services.

18. A total of eight priorities were envisaged. The section of the annex entitled "Introduction and priorities" embodied an integrated view of the planning process and thus avoided linkage to any specific opinion regarding documents A/51/6 (Perspective) and A/51/6 (Note) held by some delegations and not others.

19. A number of significant drafting changes had been made to the version of the draft resolution currently before the Committee. In section II of the draft resolution, a new paragraph 4 had been inserted, reading: "Decides to adopt paragraph 19 without prejudice to consideration by the General Assembly of the ongoing process of restructuring the Centre for Human Rights". As a consequence of that change, former paragraph 4 would be renumbered as paragraph 5. In section III, the words "including at the subprogramme level" had been inserted after the words "recommendations on priority-setting" in paragraph 2. In paragraph 3 of the same section, the words "overall agreed" had been rearranged to read "agreed overall".

20. In the annex, it had been agreed that paragraph 2 (b) would read "Promotion of sustained economic growth and sustainable development in accordance with relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and recent United Nations conferences". In paragraph 14, the words "as a separate programme" had been

added at the end of the first line beginning "Replace the texts". In addition, the words "as a new subprogramme" had been added at the end of the line beginning "Replace the text" in paragraph 17. The reference to "Paragraph 9.14" contained in paragraph 5 of the section on programme 9 had been replaced with "Paragraph 9.11". In the section on programme 19, the words "at the end of the sentence" had been added to the end of paragraph 3 (d). Finally, the brackets around programme 24 had been removed and the word "relevant" had been inserted between the words "under" and "regulations".

21. Mr. ACAKPO-SATCHIVI (Secretary of the Committee) said that the wording of paragraph 2 of section V of the draft resolution in French would be brought into line with the English version.

22. Ms. GOICOCHEA (Cuba) pointed out that the word "subprograma" should be replaced with the word "programa" in the reference to the Centre for Disarmament Affairs in the section of the annex dealing with programme 1.

23. Draft resolution A/C.5/51/L.37, as orally revised, was adopted.

24. Mr. GELBER (United States of America) and Mr. KELLY (Ireland) said that their delegations would explain their positions in plenary meeting regarding the resolution which had just been adopted.

25. Ms. GOICOCHEA (Cuba) noted that, in accordance with section I, paragraph 3, of the draft resolution, the priorities articulated by delegations would be incorporated in the approved version of the medium-term plan. It was her delegation's understanding that the changes and additions referred to by various delegations during the negotiations on agenda item 114 would be reflected in a new document listing all relevant legislative mandates.

26. Ms. INCERA (Costa Rica), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that the draft resolution reflected the fact that, for the developing countries, sustained economic growth and sustainable development were of paramount importance. In accepting the consensus language which had been used in earlier United Nations conferences, the commitment to growth and development had been reinforced.

AGENDA ITEM 122: UNITED NATIONS PENSION SYSTEM (continued)

Draft resolution A/C.5/51/L.36

27. The CHAIRMAN recalled that, on the proposal of the representative of Zambia, the Committee had decided at its previous meeting to postpone its decision on draft resolution A/C.5/51/L.36 until its current meeting, pending further consultations between the delegations of Ukraine and the Russian Federation. He hoped that the representatives of the two Member States were now in a position to advise the Committee on the best course of action to follow in order to solve the problem raised in connection with paragraph 3 of section IV.

28. Mr. BOHAYEVSKY (Ukraine) said that the matter at issue was a very complex and delicate one which concerned more than just the two States that were directly involved. There was still time to reach a solution through bilateral discussions before the matter was considered by the General Assembly. Ukraine

was not seeking to deny the rights of former participants in the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund who were now citizens of the Russian Federation. It was, however, opposed to any solution that would be at the expense of the citizens of other States, including Ukraine. He therefore appealed to the delegation of the Russian Federation to respond to the official proposals which the Ukrainian delegation had made that consideration of the matter should be deferred to the resumed fifty-first session of the General Assembly in 1997.

29. His delegation sought a just settlement of the issue and understanding for its concerns. The perception that the General Assembly was witnessing a confrontation between two States was mistaken, since the issue was not a political one. What was at stake were the dignity and self-respect of one of the States and the welfare of its citizens.

30. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Russian Federation) agreed with the representative of Ukraine that the problem was not political. Rather, it was a bilateral one of a highly technical nature and that was why his delegation considered it unacceptable to involve the United Nations in efforts to find a solution.

31. The proposed Agreement between the Government of the Russian Federation and the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Board was in response to the General Assembly's appeal to all parties concerned to continue their efforts to resolve the problems that had arisen in respect of the interpretation and application of the Transfer Agreements with the former Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, in a manner consistent with the letter and intent of the Agreements.

32. The Ukrainian proposal to defer consideration of the draft resolution was neither a procedural motion nor an amendment to the draft resolution. It amounted to a substantive proposal to revise the provisions of the Agreement and to review the timetable for its implementation. A decision to defer consideration of the matter to the resumed fifty-first session would mean that at least 300 individuals would be unable to receive their pension payments on 1 January 1997. There was thus a humanitarian aspect to the problem also. The logical course of action was for the Committee to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.5/51/L.36 forthwith, in accordance with rule 131 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, which provided that if two or more proposals related to the same question, the Committee should vote on the proposals in the order in which they had been submitted.

33. The CHAIRMAN asked whether there were any objections to the proposal by Ukraine to defer consideration of the draft resolution to the resumed fifty-first session.

34. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Russian Federation) said that the proposal was unacceptable to his delegation.

35. The CHAIRMAN said that a vote would be taken on the proposal by Ukraine to defer consideration of the draft resolution to the resumed fifty-first session.

36. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Russian Federation) said that the proposal to defer consideration of the item was neither a procedural motion nor an amendment to the earlier proposal. It was in fact a new proposal and, consequently, the

Committee should vote on the proposals in the order in which they had been submitted.

37. The CHAIRMAN recalled that the Committee had earlier accepted the proposal by Zambia to postpone its decision on a draft resolution submitted by the Chairman. What was currently before the Committee, therefore, was a new proposal by Ukraine on which a vote must now be taken.

38. Mr. BOHAYEVSKY (Ukraine), speaking on a point of order, endorsed the view just expressed by the Chairman and drew attention to rule 128 of the rules of procedure, which provided that after the Chairman had announced the beginning of voting, the voting could be interrupted only on a point of order in connection with the actual conduct of the voting.

39. At the request of the representative of Ukraine, a recorded vote was taken on the proposal.

In favour: Estonia, Latvia, Marshall Islands, Ukraine.

Against: Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, France, Germany, India, Japan, Kazakstan, Morocco, New Zealand, Russian Federation, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zambia.

Abstaining: Algeria, Andorra, Bahamas, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Bolivia, Botswana, Bulgaria, Chile, Colombia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Fiji, Finland, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Kenya, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Malta, Mexico, Namibia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Romania, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Thailand, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zimbabwe.

40. The Ukrainian proposal was rejected by 18 votes to 4, with 61 abstentions.

41. Mr. BOHAYEVSKY (Ukraine) expressed regret that Ukraine's concerns over a matter that was of great importance to its citizens had not met with greater understanding.

42. Mr. STEIN (Germany), supported by Mr. SCOTTI (France) and Mr. SCHLESINGER (Austria), appealed to the delegations concerned to try to reach an agreement on the basis of the various proposals that had been made in the Committee. Recourse to voting would not help to resolve the situation.

43. The CHAIRMAN asked whether he should take it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/C.5/51/L.36 as a whole without a vote.

44. Mr. BOHAYEVSKY (Ukraine) asked whether the Committee had a quorum to take a decision on the draft resolution as a whole.

45. Mr. ACAKPO-SATCHIVI (Secretary of the Committee) said that the required quorum was 93 members. There were 119 delegations present in the room, although not all of them might participate in the voting.

46. Mr. BOHAYEVSKY (Ukraine) said that he wished to make a new proposal, namely, that consideration of section IV of the draft resolution should be deferred and not be included in the vote which was about to take place.

47. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Russian Federation) said that a vote must be taken on the new proposal by Ukraine.

48. Mr. BOHAYEVSKY (Ukraine) said that his delegation's new proposal was based on rule 129 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Assembly.

49. The CHAIRMAN, after reading out rule 129 of the Rules of Procedure, proposed that the Committee should take action on draft resolution A/C.5/51/L.36 as a whole.

50. Mr. HANSON (Canada) said that he would welcome clarification of the nature of the proposal. If the proposal was to delete part of the draft resolution, that proposal should be voted on first.

51. Mr. BOHAYEVSKY (Ukraine), questioning the Chairman's interpretation of rule 129, said that a decision must be taken on whether or not to include section IV of the draft resolution.

52. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Russian Federation) said that his delegation was opposed to the deletion of section IV of the draft resolution, for the humanitarian and technical reasons he had previously mentioned.

53. Mr. GIERI (Secretary of the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Board), in reply to a query from the representative of Senegal, said that the deletion of section IV would amount to a decision not to approve the Board's recommendation for an agreement between the Board and the Russian Federation, and the Board would therefore have no basis for taking any further action in that regard.

54. A recorded vote was taken on the Ukrainian proposal, to delete section IV of draft resolution A/C.5/51/L.36.

In favour:	Latvia, Ukraine.
Against:	Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Brazil, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Iceland, India, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kazakstan, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Morocco, New Zealand, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Singapore, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zambia.

Abstaining: Australia, Bahamas, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Jamaica, Kenya, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Lithuania, Malaysia, Malta, Mexico, Namibia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Romania, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Thailand, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zimbabwe.

55. The Ukrainian proposal was rejected by 31 votes to 2, with 50 abstentions.

56. At the request of the representative of Ukraine, a recorded vote was taken on section IV of draft resolution A/C.5/51/L.36.

In favour: Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Costa Rica, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Guyana, Iceland, India, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kazakstan, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Morocco, New Zealand, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Spain, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zambia.

Against: Ukraine.

Abstaining: Australia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Guatemala, Haiti, Hungary, Jamaica, Latvia, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Lithuania, Malaysia, Malta, Mexico, Namibia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zimbabwe.

57. Section IV of draft resolution A/C.5/51/L.36 was adopted by 32 votes to 1, with 48 abstentions.

58. At the request of the representative of Ukraine, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.5/51/L.36 as a whole.

In favour: Algeria, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bolivia, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Czech Republic, Denmark, Egypt, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Iceland, India, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Malta, Mauritania, Micronesia (Federated States of), Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, New Zealand, Norway, Philippines, Poland, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Solomon Islands,

South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Ukraine.

Abstaining: Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bulgaria, Ecuador, Estonia, Hungary, Jamaica, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Lithuania, Mexico, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Republic of Moldova, Uruguay, Venezuela.

59. Draft resolution A/C.5/51/L.36, as a whole, was adopted by 78 votes to 1, with 19 abstentions.

60. Mr. STOECKL (Germany) said that his delegation supported section IV, as it would permit some groups in the fund to benefit. He hoped it would be possible to take the concerns of Ukraine into consideration in the future.

61. Mr. SCHLESINGER (Austria) said he hoped that the further steps envisaged in the proposed agreement would be taken by both Governments concerned.

62. Mr. BLUKIS (Latvia) said that he had abstained in the voting on section IV, since his delegation had not had enough time to ascertain what the rights of Latvian residents would be under the 1981 transfer agreement. His delegation supported the resolution as a whole, and considered that the interests of pensioners should not be adversely affected by section IV.

63. Mr. LUKK (Estonia) said he regretted that consensus had not been reached.

AGENDA ITEM 112: REVIEW OF THE EFFICIENCY OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL FUNCTIONING OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Draft resolution A/C.5/51/L.40

64. Mr. STEIN (Germany), Vice Chairman, said that paragraph 8 of the draft resolution should read:

> "Decides that the priorities for the biennium 1998-1999 are the following: maintenance of international peace and security; promotion of sustained economic growth and sustainable development in accordance with relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and recent United Nations conferences; development of Africa; promotion of human rights; effective coordination of humanitarian assistance efforts; promotion of justice and international law; disarmament; drug control, crime prevention, as well as combating international terrorism in all its forms and manifestations;"

By adopting the draft resolution, the General Assembly would invite the Secretary-General to submit a preliminary estimate for the biennium 1998-1999 on the basis totalling $2,512 million at initial 1996-1997 rates and would decide

that the contingency fund should be set at the level of 0.75 per cent of the preliminary estimate at 1998-1999 rates; that the recosting for the programme budget for the biennium 1998-1999 should follow the existing methodology, and that the preliminary estimates of resources for 1998-1999 did not include a provision for special missions. The draft resolution also requested the Secretary-General to submit certain information, and to prepare a policy paper which would examine all issues related to the question of all additional expenditures referred to in paragraphs 10 and 11 of annex I to resolution 41/213.

65. Ms. PEÑA (Mexico) pointed out that a draft resolution on the same agenda item as draft resolution A/C.5/51/L.40 had been introduced by a group of delegations at a previous meeting, and was still before the Committee. Although she understood that consensus had been reached on the draft resolution just introduced, it was necessary, for procedural reasons, to have the previous draft resolution formally withdrawn before taking action on the other draft.

66. Mr. ACAKPO-SATCHIVI (Secretary of the Committee) said that the proper procedure was for the Committee to adopt the draft resolution on which consensus had been reached. The earlier draft resolution should then be withdrawn by the group of States which had introduced it.

67. Ms. PEÑA (Mexico) said that draft resolutions should be considered in the order in which they were introduced. However, she would not insist that the status of the first draft resolution should be announced before the second one was adopted, since a consensus had been reached.

68. Draft resolution A/C.5/51/L.40, as orally revised, was adopted.

69. Mr. GOKHALE (India) said that he had joined the consensus on the resolution just adopted on the understanding that the Secretary-General would not include in his proposed programme budget for the 1998-1999 any provision for special missions which had no legislative mandates until the General Assembly had found a comprehensive solution to the problem of all additional expenditures. Meanwhile, current budgetary procedures under General Assembly resolution 41/213 made adequate provision for meeting such expenditures; in fact, the General Assembly had, for that reason, disallowed a proposal by the Secretary-General to make provision for the special missions in the budget for the biennium 1994-1995. The Assembly must be consistent in its decision.

70. The Secretary-General's proposal to make provision in the budget for special missions in the biennium 1998-1999 ran counter to the Organization's experience with the budget for 1996-1997, which was expected to absorb virtually all the expenses resulting from additional mandates. The Secretary-General should draw upon that experience in making proposals for the next biennium. No resolution relating to a specific biennium could be deemed to supersede the procedures established for the budget process; only a change in the legislation governing that process could do so. He expected that the Secretary-General's proposed budget for 1998-1999 would adhere strictly to the draft resolution just adopted.

71. Mr. ARMITAGE (Australia), speaking also on behalf of Canada and New Zealand, said that he regretted that his delegation had been unable to make a

statement on the proposed programme budget outline for 1998-1999 (A/51/289), owing to time constraints and the late distribution of documents. He supported the outline proposed by the Secretary-General, which was a good basis on which to prepare a disciplined and responsible budget for the next biennium. The proposal to include a provision for special missions had represented a welcome effort to address the fact that significant charges to the regular budget were not included in the initial appropriations. That situation was not in the best interests of sound budgetary planning and control. However, he agreed that the proposal's implications for existing budgetary procedures required further consideration and, in that connection, looked forward to receiving the policy paper requested in the draft resolution. The objective of a leaner, more efficient Organization should be taken into account in the preparation of the next budget.

72. Ms. GOICOCHEA (Cuba) said that, although she had joined the consensus on the draft resolution just adopted, she regretted that it did not provide for a higher level of resources for the Secretariat, especially in view of the negative impact of savings measures on the Organization's functioning. However, the resolution was fully consistent with the budget process established in General Assembly resolution 41/213. She welcomed the recognition, in paragraph 6, that the existing methodology for recosting should be maintained. She attached great importance to the request for information contained in paragraph 9, and hoped that the Secretary-General would take into account, in his proposed programme budget for 1998-1999, the negative impact of the savings measures on activities and programmes approved by the General Assembly.

73. Mr. NOUR (Egypt) said that he disagreed with some of the proposals in the report of the Secretary-General (A/51/289) because they departed from the provisions of General Assembly resolution 41/213 and that he shared the view of the Indian and Cuban delegations that the proposed programme budget for 1998-1999 should be based on the draft resolution just adopted.

74. Mr. KELLY (Ireland), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that his delegation would explain its position in the plenary Assembly after the proposed budget outline was adopted and that he welcomed the consensus which the Fifth Committee had reached on the issue.

75. Ms. INCERA (Costa Rica), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that, in the light of the adoption of draft resolution A/C.5/51/L.40, her delegation withdrew draft resolution A/C.5/51/L.31.

Draft decision A/C.5/51/L.28

76. Mr. ACAKPO-SATCHIVI (Secretary of the Committee) said that subparagraphs (g) and (h), which concerned agenda items 121 and 122, should be deleted from the draft decision.

77. Draft decision A/C.5/51/L.28, as orally revised, was adopted.

Draft decision A/C.5/51/L.29

78. Mr. ACAKPO-SATCHIVI (Secretary of the Committee) said that a new item 11 bis, "Report of the Secretary-General on the activities of the Office of

Internal Oversight Services", should be added in part A of the annex to the draft decision. The same item should be added in part B as item 14 bis.

79. Draft decision A/C.5/51/L.29, as orally revised, was adopted.

COMPLETION OF THE COMMITTEE'S WORK FOR THE MAIN PART OF THE FIFTY-FIRST SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

80. After an exchange of courtesies, in which Ms. PEÑA (Mexico), on behalf of the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States, Ms. INCERA (Costa Rica), on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, Mr. JAREMCZUK (Poland), on behalf of the Group of Eastern European States, Mr. MAIGA (Mali), on behalf of the Group of African States, Mr. HANSON (Canada) on behalf of the Group of Western European and Other States, and Mr. TOYA (Japan), on behalf of the Group of Asian States, took part, The CHAIRMAN declared that the Fifth Committee had completed its work for the main part of the fifty-first session of the General Assembly.

The meeting rose at 5.35 p.m.